

REMARKSRejections of claims 1, 6, 7, and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,515,356 B1 (hereinafter "Shin") in view of US Patent 5,273,938 A (hereinafter "Lin").

Regarding claim 1, Applicants erroneously added "wherein die attach material is interposed between the first integrated circuit and the second integrated circuit" to claim 1 in the previous amendment. This erroneous text has been removed in the current amendment.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include first pads located on the first surface and second pads located on the second surface, wherein the encapsulating material does not overlie at least one pad (either one of the first pads or one of the second pads), and wherein the at least one pad is accessible for testing purposes. This is not taught or even suggested by Shin or Lin.

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner has asserted that Lin discloses "using a die attach material 22 interposed between a first integrated circuit and a second integrated circuit" (Office Action dated 11/14/2003, page 5, paragraph 7). Applicants respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to the Specification of Lin (col. 3, lines 54-56) where 22 is clearly stated to be "wire bonds", and to FIG. 4 of Lin where wire bonds 22 are clearly not interposed between a first integrated circuit and a second integrated circuit.

Dependent claims 7 and 11-15 are allowable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claim 6.

Rejections of claims 2-5, 9, 10 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2-5, 9, 10 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Lin, and further in view of US Patent 5,291,062 A (hereinafter "Higgins").

As claim 2 has been amended to cover a different feature, the Examiner's argument regarding claim 2 is now moot.

Regarding claim 3, Applicants have amended claim 3 by adding "wherein the encapsulating material does not overlie at least one pad". Shin, Lin, and Higgins do not teach or even suggest this.

Dependent claims 4 and 5 are allowable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claim 3.

Dependent claims 9, 10 and 28 are allowable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claim 6 (see first section, rejection of claim 6 under Shin in view of Lin).

Rejections of claims 8 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 8 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin in view of Lin, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0047798 A1 (hereinafter "Halahan").

Dependent claims 8 and 29 are allowable for at least the same reasons as given above for independent claim 6 (see first section, rejection of claim 6 under Shin in view of Lin).

Rejections of claims 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,133,067 A (hereinafter "Jeng").

Applicants have amended claim 30 to state "wherein the package substrate is not formed from encapsulating material". Jeng teaches a molded compound 17 (Jeng, col. 3, line 56), which is an encapsulating material.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact me if there are any issues regarding this communication or the current Application.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Customer Number

By:


Susan C. Hill
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 35,896
Telephone: (512) 996-6839
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854